

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-10. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

The Examiner also objected to claims 1-10 for lack of enablement. In particular, the Examiner wrote that during system boot-up, when none of the server can decide what type of the other servers it is coupling to because none of the servers has assumed any specific role (Office Action, p.2, paragraph 3, lines 6-9). Applicant respectfully submits that the first and second paragraphs on p.10 of the Specification describe how configuration is done in one embodiment of the invention. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, the Examiner wrote that there appears to be no teaching regarding assignment of unique identifiers to each of the servers and the Examiner considered this to be a critical step because without unique identifiers, the servers within the group of slave servers or within the group of local master servers would not be able to distinguish among themselves. Although Applicant may not agree with the Examiner that this is a critical aspect of the invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the assignment of unique identifiers to servers is well known in the art. For example, in one of the cited references, U.S. Patent to Dean et al. (U.S. 5,914,957; hereinafter, "Dean") has disclosed the assignment of unique identifiers to servers (Dean, Abstract). It is not necessary for Applicant to repeat information or details well known in the art in the Specification in order to meet the enablement requirement. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al. (U.S. Pub. 20010007086; hereinafter, “Rogers”) in view of Dean. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 as amended sets forth one or more slave servers coupled to the local master server via a second network to perform manufacturing tasks to facilitate building products, the global master, local master, and slave servers being programmed the same, the one or more slave servers being automatically configurable as one or more slave servers with respect to the local master server based on an interface between the local master server and each of the one or more slave servers, and the local master server being automatically configurable as a master server with respect to the one or more slave servers based on the interface between the local master server and each of the one or more slave servers. It is respectfully submitted that both Rogers and Dean fail to disclose at least such a limitation. The Examiner admitted in the Office Action that Rogers does not disclose the above limitation (Office Action, p.3, last paragraph).

According to Dean, in order to configure the servant nodes, the master node *sends configuration messages and configuration enable signals* to the corresponding servant nodes via a daisy-chain communication link (Dean, col. 1, line 60 – col. 2, line 20; col. 3, lines 28-35; Figure 1). Except the first and the last servant nodes in the daisy-chain, the rest of the servant nodes do not interface with the master node, but with two of the servant nodes instead (Dean, Figure 1). Therefore, the servant node in Dean does not, and cannot, automatically configure itself as a slave server based on an interface between the corresponding slave server and the master server. Since neither Dean nor Rogers discloses at least the limitation set forth above, claim 1 as amended is patentable over Rogers in view of Dean. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from claim 1, and thus, claims 2-7 and 10 are patentable over Rogers in view of Dean for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers, Dean, and Steen et al. (U.S. 6,510,350; hereinafter, “Steen”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 8-9 depend from claim 1, and hence, claims 8 and 9 incorporate the limitations in claim 1. For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rogers and Dean fail to disclose every limitation in each of claims 8 and 9. Furthermore, Steen fails to make up the deficiencies in Rogers and Dean. Therefore, claims 8 and 9 are patentable over Rogers, Dean, and Steen. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gubbi (U.S. 6,434,113; hereinafter, “Gubbi”) in view of Dean. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 11 sets forth a second interface, wherein the processor is operable to automatically configure a plurality of servers as slave servers **if the plurality of servers are coupled to the second interface.** The Examiner admitted in the Office Action that Gubbi fails to disclose the above limitation (Office Action, p. 7, last paragraph). However, the Examiner contended that Dean discloses the above limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s argument.

According to Dean, the master node configures the servant nodes by *sending configuration messages and configuration enable signals* to the corresponding servant nodes (Dean, col. 1, line 60 – col. 2, line 20). The servant nodes in Dean are not automatically configured as slave servers if the servant nodes are coupled to an interface of the master server. Therefore, Dean fails to disclose the limitation of claim 11 recited above. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify the system in Dean to come up with the present invention as claimed because of the different configurations of the systems. Since neither Dean nor Gubbi discloses the limitation recited above, claim 11 is patentable over Gubbi in view of Dean. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-13 depend from claim 11. For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 11, claims 12-13 are patentable over Gubbi in view of Dean. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Withdrawal of these objections and rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-13 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 29, 2004



Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 29, 2004.



Esther Campbell 7-29-04
Date